

Appl. No. 10/821,358
Amdt. Dated , 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

Remarks

Claims 1-13 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 14-20 have been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-15 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (admission).

In response to the rejection, applicant has canceled claims 1-5 and 12 without prejudice, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (admission) in view of Fukuyoshi (US 4,853,296).

In response to the rejection, applicant has canceled claim 6 without prejudice, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (admission) in view of Kim et al (US 5,850,271).

In response to the rejection, applicant has canceled claims 7-11 without prejudice, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

New claims 14-20 have been added, and no new matter is added.

Appl. No. 10/821,358
Amdt. Dated Oct. 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

Claim 14 recites in part: "...the black matrix comprising an antireflection layer formed on the transparent substrate and a light-shielding layer formed on the antireflection layer; and coating a color resin layer on the transparent substrate and the black matrix...each of the RGB resins comprises joint portions jointing adjacent resins, and the joint portions are lapped one over the other above corresponding portions of the black matrix..." Applicant submits that there is nothing in the cited references that teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they might or should provide the method for manufacturing a color filter of claim 14. Furthermore, the method as recited in claim 14 produces new and unexpected results. That is, the method can make a color filter have low reflectivity on both surfaces thereof. Accordingly, a liquid crystal display device using the color filter provides high brightness and contrast.

Accordingly, claim 14 is submitted to be novel, unobvious and patentable over all the cited art under both s.102(b) and s.103. Claims 15-17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 14, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claim 18 recites the limitations similar and corresponding to those recited in claim 14, and is therefore submitted to be novel, unobvious and patentable over all the cited art under both s.102(b) and s.103. Claims 19-20 depend directly and indirectly from claim 18, and therefore should also be allowable.

In summary, new claims 14-20 are believed to be patentable and in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheng-Shiou Yeh et al

Appl. No. 10/821,358
Amdt. Dated Oct. 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

By



Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-613